DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 628 EA 003 327

AUTHOR	Smith, Robert A.; Fox, Frank H.
TITLE	Expressed Attitude of Teachers Toward Negotiation: A Factor Analytic Study.
PUB DATE	7 Feb 71
NOTE	12p.; Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting (55th, New York, New York, February 4-7, 1971)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Collective Negotiation, *Negotiation Agreements, *School Surveys, *Teacher Attitudes, Teacher Employment, *Teacher Participation, Teacher Salaries

ABSTRACT

This study determined the attitudes of teachers toward the negotiation procedures presently employed, and developed an instrument to predict the level of support and desired involvement of teachers in negotiation procedures. Results of the investigation implied that teachers distinguish between two general negotiation areas: (1) professional duties, and (2) working conditions. Teachers are most concerned that they be involved in a determination of negotiating items in the area of professional duties, and demonstrate a willingness to assume a more passive role in the area of working conditions. (Author)

ED048628

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Paper Delivered at
American Educational Research Association
Annual Meeting
New York City
February 7, 1971

EXPRESSED ATTITUDE OF TEACHERS TOWARD NEGOTIATION: A FACTOR ANALYTIC STUDY

Robert A. Smith and Frank H. Fox
University of Southern California

The rapid growth of negotiated agreements between teacher groups and boards of education during the 1960's is well documented even though authorities in the field disagree on what started the drive toward negotiations. Converse of the American Federation of Teachers dates the beginning of the movement with the December 1961 bargaining election in New York City. Chanin of the National Education Association credits the executive order by former President John F. Kennedy covering the labor-management relations in federal service in early 1962 as providing the impetus.

Regardless of the starting point, twenty-six states now have teachers negotiation laws. In general these laws require the teacher group and the board of education to enter into a written agreement. These written agreements, whether they are the result of "collective bargaining" or "professional negotiations," have reached the point that one writer in the area has indicated the "contract talks proceed most smoothly when both sides hire attorneys experienced in the field to do the negotiating for them" (Brenton, p. 126). At the same time "both groups /NEA and AFT/ agree on a key point about the future: disputes between teachers and school boards are going to shift from wages and working conditions to the control of educational policy" (as reported in the Los Angeles Times, December 11, 1970).

EA 003 327

Given these two conditions, the employment of professional negotiators and expansion of the contract to include educational policy, it is suggested that a method be developed to allow the teachers to express their attitudes concerning the process of and items for negotiation.

PROCEDURE

Suggested items in the general area of negotiation were collected under four headings: (1) attitude of teachers toward the negotiation process, (2) evaluation by the teachers of the negotiation process, (3) teachers' perception of the effectiveness of the negotiation process as practiced in their district, and (4) subjects which should (or should not) be included in the negotiating procedures.

Seventy-two items were selected in the four areas (eighteen for each area). These items were randomly ordered and half of them by random selection were recast as negative statements. Each item could be answered with one of five scale values: (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) undecided, (4) disagree, and (5) strongly disagree.

Eighty-nine teachers in a school district which was considered to be representative of teachers in Southern California responded to the seventy-two attitudinal statements. A Varimax factor analysis of their responses was then performed. Following the usual procedures of accepting factors with associated eigen values greater than one, nineteen factors were identified, which accounted 88 percent of the total variance. Since this was an exploratory study, those items which had a factor loading of 0.50 were used to interpret the factors. This criteria identified thirty of the original seventy-two items for inclusion in the revision. The resulting attitude inventory consisted of seventeen positive and thirteen negative randomly ordered items.

The revised instrument was submitted to teachers in ten school districts. The first six school districts that completed the questionnaire were used for validation of the original factor study. Table I identifies the factor loadings and proportion of total variance for each identified factor.

There were 169 teachers in the six districts which completed the questionnaire. Twenty-six of the thirty items could be associated with the six factors previously identified. A listing of the items (in order of importance) associated with each factor and a suggested name for the factor are as follows:

Factor I

1. My association was effective in using the negotiation process for improving the teaching situation with respect to the assignment and duties of teacher aides and paraprofessionals.

2. Sufficient emphasis was displayed by my association when negotiating with respect to the selection and evaluation of federal projects.

3. My association effectively used the negotiation process to improve the teachers' position with respect to the selection of school principals.

4. Sufficient emphasis was displayed by my association when negotiating in the general area of student discipline.

5. My association effectively used the negotiation process to improve the teachers' position with respect to teacher assistance--secretarial and clerical.

6. My association was effective in using the negotiation process for improving the teachers' working conditions.

Tentative name: ASSESSMENT OF THE ASSOCIATION AS A NEGOTIATING AGENT WITH RESPECT TO PROFESSIONAL DUTIES

Factor II

1. I was not actively involved in helping the association determine the goals for negotiation concerning class size.

2. I was not actively involved in helping the association determine the goals for negotiation with respect to supervision of extra-curricular activities.

3. I was not actively involved in helping the association determine the goals for negotiation concerning the selection and planning of in-service programs.

4. I was not actively involved in helping the association determine the goals for negotiation concerning working conditions.

5. I was not actively involved in helping the association determine the goals for negotiation with respect to teacher salaries.

6. I was not actively involved in helping the association specify the negotiation goals concerning individual school organizational structure.

Tentative name: INDIVIDUAL INVOLVEMENT IN DEFINING OVERALL NEGOTIATION OBJECTIVES

Factor III

1. My association should negotiate teacher salaries.

2. Grievance procedures should be a negotiable item.

3. My association should negotiate working conditions.

Tentative name: PRIMARY OBJECTIVES OF NEGOTIATION--WORKING CONDITIONS AND COMPENSATION

Factor IV

1. Sufficient emphasis was displayed by my association when negotiating teacher salaries.

2. Sufficient emphasis was displayed by my association when negotiating employee fringe benefits.

3. My association was not effective in using the negotiation process for improving the teachers' position with respect to salaries.

4. Sufficient emphasis was not displayed by my association when negotiating procedures for determination of class size.

Tentative name: NEGOTIATING AGENT'S EFFECTIVENESS IN ACHIEVING PRIMARY OBJECTIVES

Factor V

1. I was actively involved in helping the association determine negotiation goals concerning the non-teaching duties of teachers.

2. I was actively involved in helping the association determine the goals for negotiation concerning employee fringe benefits.

3. I was actively involved in helping the association specify the negotiation goals with respect to a twelve month contract for teachers.

Tentative name: INDIVIDUAL INVOLVEMENT IN DEFINING PRIMARY OBJECTIVES FOR NEGOTIATION

Factor VI

1. My association should negotiate with respect to the selection and evaluation of federal projects.

2. My association should not negotiate the selection and planning of in-service programs.

3. My association should not negotiate the assignment and duties of teacher aides and paraprofessionals.

4. Selection of school principals should be a negotiable item.

Tentative name: SECONDARY OBJECTIVES OF NEGOTIATION--WORKING ENVIRONMENT

Other Items

My association should not negotiate procedures for determination of class size.

My association should not negotiate to establish priorities for budgetary expenditures.

Sufficient emphasis was not displayed by my association when negotiating the assignment and duties of teacher aides and paraprofessionals.

My association should negotiate employee fringe benefits.

A score was calculated for each factor by first rescoring all negatively stated items; Factor II items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6; Factor IV items 3 and 4; Factor VI items 2 and 3; and then calculating an average value for each factor.

Factor	Average	95% Confidence Band
I	3.3	2.9 - 3.8
II	3.6	3.1 - 4.0
III	1.3	1.0 - 1.6
IV	2.9	2.6 - 3.2
V	3.1	2.5 - 3.7
VI	2.5	2.2 - 2.8

Assuming the 169 teachers are representative of teachers in general, there is strong agreement that the association should negotiate working conditions and compensation (Factor III). Working environment (Factor VI) as a subject for negotiation receives some positive support. The negotiating council received an essentially neutral rating in their success in negotiating the primary objectives (Factor IV). This undecided rating apparently carries over into the individual involvement in defining the primary objectives (Factor V).

The major concern of the teachers appears to be the council's role, or perhaps the role of negotiations, when the professional responsibilities of the teacher are involved. Factor I received a slightly negative score. This somewhat negative appraisal could be the result of either or both of these possibilities: (1) The teachers are not sure that this should be an area of negotiation, or (2) The council did not do an effective job in negotiating in this area.

Considering Factor I in conjunction with the distinctly negative rating in Factor II would indicate that if the council does formulate negotiating goals in the area of professional duties, the teachers want to be specifically involved in establishing the objectives. Item five of Factor II appears to be a statistical anomaly. Logically, this item would be included in Factor V.

If this particular item had been placed by the teachers in the same category as the items for Factor IV, it would allow Factor II to be related to Factor I in the same manner that Factor V is associated with Factor IV.

The 95% confidence band (assuming thirty or more respondents) is designed to identify groups of teachers which significantly deviate from the assumed average response. Whenever a particular response to a factor falls outside this band, it seems important to determine what is causing the variability.

These interpretations must be qualified by some consideration of the specific individuals answering the inventory. An important assumption is that the individuals were a representative selection from the total population of teachers. The necessity of making repeated requests to secure responses to the inventory casts considerable suspicion on the reasonableness of this assumption.

A second possible confounding variable that should be noted is that most teachers answered the questionnaire late in June (a well known nadir for teachers) and early in July during summer school (an atypical sample). As a consequence, it would be expected that some variations would be present if used during the school year.

A second part of the questionnaire attempted to determine the level of support the teachers would provide during the negotiation procedures.

The teachers ranked the suggested procedures (from "strong support" to "strongly oppose") as follows:

1. Fact Finding (with recommendations for resolution):
   Average Score*: 1.4
   95% Confidence Band: 1.2 - 1.6
2. Sanctions:
   Average Score*: 2.2
   95% Confidence Band: 2.0 - 2.4

3. Board Recall Campaign:

   Average Score*: 2.3

   95% Confidence Band: 2.1 - 2.5

4. Nonperformance of Extra-Curricular Duties:

   Average Score*: 2.6

   95% Confidence Band: 2.3 - 2.9

5. Informational Picketing:

   Average Score*: 2.8

   95% Confidence Band: 2.5 - 3.1

6. Strike:

   Average Score*: 3.2

   95% Confidence Band: 2.9 - 3.5

(*Scale from '1', strong support, to '5', strongly oppose.)

The tentative interpretation of these rankings would indicate the teachers would strongly support Fact Finding, would provide support for Sanctions and Board Recall Campaigns, but were essentially neutral to the other alternatives.

The qualifications with respect to representativeness delineated for the factor analysis should be applied to this set of findings. Demographic information was collected with respect to the respondents. A separate report is being prepared to analyze these findings with respect to (1) grade level, (2) number of years in teaching, (3) age, (4) sex, and (5) status in teacher association.

Discussion

It is tempting to do some minor rearranging of the items. In particular, moving Item 5 of Factor II over to Factor V would allow a more logical identification of the factor. Reasonably the factors could be categorized into two general areas: (1) working conditions, and (2) professional duties. In each of these areas the teachers indicate (a) the desirability of negotiating in

the area, (b) the effectiveness of negotiating procedures in the area, and (c) the individual's involvement in determining the objectives of negotiating in the area.

	Professional Duties	Working Conditions
Area for Negotiation	Factor VI	Factor III
Association's Effectiveness in Negotiations	Factor I	Factor IV
Individual's Involvement in Negotiation *Procedures*	Factor II	Factor V

The general interpretation under these assumptions would be that teachers recognize the necessity of negotiating in the area of working conditions and compensation. They (the teachers) are essentially unimpressed with the present negotiations in this area and not particularly concerned with their involvement in determining the objectives. The interpretation in the area of professional duties presents a very different picture. The teachers believe there should be negotiation in this area. They are not impressed with the present activities and are most interested in their own involvement in determining the objectives of negotiations.

Analysis of the levels of support for the suggested procedures for negotiation resolution suggest the teachers will endorse covert (fact finding) procedures for applying pressure. The degree of support decreases as the tactics require active participation. The more active the involvement, the less the support, with the most active procedure (strike) receiving a general negative endorsement.

Conclusions

The purpose of this investigation was to determine the attitudes of teachers toward the negotiation procedures presently employed and develop an instrument which could be used to predict the level of support and desired involvement of the teachers in the negotiation procedures. The initial investigation implied the teachers distinguish between two general areas of negotiation--professional duties and working conditions. They are most concerned with being involved in determination of negotiating items in the area of professional duties and apparently are willing to assume a more passive role in the area of working conditions.

References

Blum, Albert A. (Ed.) Teacher Unions and Associations: A Comparative Study. Chicago, Illinois: University of Illinois Press; 1969.

Brenton, Myron What's Happened to Teacher? New York: Coward-McCann, Inc.; 1970.

Stinnett, T. M. Professional Problems of Teachers (Third Edition). New York: The Macmillan Company; 1968.

Stinnett, T. M. The Teacher Dropout. Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.; 1970.

Table 1

FACTORS IDENTIFIED FROM TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
I - 1 (24)*	82					
- 2 (22)	78					
- 3 (28)	74					
- 4 (23)	73					
- 5 (15)	61			29	-22	
- 6 (27)	59			44		
Percent of Total Variance - 17.9%						
II - 1 (19)		-81				
- 2 (20)		-79				
- 3 (18)		-78				
- 4 (25)		-70			29	
- 5 (4)		57		-20	25	
- 6 (5)		51				
Percent of Total Variance - 14.7%						
III - 1 (6)			87			
- 2 (7)			87			
- 3 (8)			82			
Percent of Total Variance - 11.2%						
IV - 1 (11)	29			76		
- 2 (10)	21			75	-25	
- 3 (20)		-20		73		
- 4 (13)		28		-58		
Percent of Total Variance - 6.6%						
V - 1 (3)					82	
- 2 (9)					81	
- 3 (1)					76	
Percent of Total Variance - 5.1%						
VI - 1 (12)						80
- 2 (16)	45	-20				-56
- 3 (17)	49	-24				-54
- 4 (2)			33	-38		53
Percent of Total Variance - 4.9%						
(14)	40	-27			-39	
(21)	45	-44				-39
(29)		-44		-32		
(30)			44			

*All decimal points omitted. All loadings with absolute values less than .20 are suppressed.
Items are identified in order in text discussion of the items. Figures in parentheses identify position of items in administered inventory.